UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/049,266	09/09/2002	Andreas Kling	50559	9439

32116 7590 05/12/2005

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ, CLARK & MORTIMER
500 W. MADISON STREET
SUITE 3800
CHICAGO, IL 60661

EXAMINER	
KIFLE, BRUCK	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1624	

DATE MAILED: 05/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/049,266	KLING ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Bruck Kifle, Ph.D.	1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 March 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *15-17,19 and 22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *17* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *15, 16, 19 and 22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Applicant's amendments and remarks filed 03/24/05 have been received and reviewed. Claims 15-17, 19 and 22 are now pending in this application.

The search and examination is of the claims is to the extent wherein in formula I "X_G" is connected to "L." Claim 17 remains withdrawn from consideration because it is not of the same scope as the compound of formula I.

A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 15, 16, 19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The last phrase of claim 15 recites the term "prodrugs." The nature of the "prodrugs" is not known. One skilled in the art cannot say what derivative of the instant compound results in a prodrug and what does not. One cannot say what it looks like. Understanding the scope of the term requires substantial research.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification does not reasonably provide enablement for treating the diseases embraced by the claim. The claim is drawn in part to treating tumor growth and metastasis, cancer, psoriasis or viral, parasitic or bacterial diseases and inflammations.

Regarding the treatment of cancer (as well as tumor growth and metastasis), the specification does not provide enablement for the treatment of cancer generally. No compound has ever been found that can treat cancers generally even though massive efforts have been

directed towards this end. Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in oncology, proof must be provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits. Nearly all anticancer drugs are effective against only a limited group of related cancers. Therefore, a compound effective against cancer generally would be a revolutionary exception. Applicant is asserting that he succeeded where others have failed. Where extensive efforts have all failed, it is reasonable for the Patent and Trademark Office to require proof that the claimed invention actually works for this specific utility. It is well established that a utility rejection is proper when scope of enablement is not reasonably correlated to the scope of the claims. (In re Vaeck 20 USPQ2d 1439, 1444, In re Ferens 163 USPQ 609).

In re Buting 163 USPQ 689 establishes that even clinical tests showing that a compound found to be useful in the treatment of two types of cancers was not sufficient for a much broader range.

Treating viral diseases is extremely difficult. The record is filled with new compounds that were highly touted only to show no benefit in human efficacy clinical trials. The approaches that have been fruitful take advantage of precisely defined molecular features of the virus and have resulted in effective therapy for herpes and AIDS. It is optimistic in the extreme to believe that given the history of anti-viral research that an agent will be effective on such a diverse class of viruses that share physical but not molecular features. The claim calls for the treatment of viral diseases generally. Despite intensive efforts, pharmaceutical science has been unable to find a way of getting a compound to be effective for the treatment of viruses generally. Under such circumstances, it is proper for the PTO to require evidence that such an unprecedented feat has actually been accomplished, *In re Ferens*, 163 USPQ 609. No such evidence has been presented

in this case. The failure of skilled scientists to achieve a goal is substantial evidence that achieving such a goal is beyond the skill of practitioners in that art, *Genentech vs. Novo Nordisk*, 42 USPQ2nd 1001, 1006. Similarly, parasitic and bacterial diseases cannot all be treated using a single drug.

Inflammation is a process that can take place in virtually any part of the body. There is a vast range of forms that it can take, causes for the problem, and biochemical pathways that mediate the inflammatory reaction. There is no common mechanism by which all, or even most, inflammations arise. Mediators include bradykinin, serotonin, C3a, C5a, histamine, leukotrienes, cytokines, and many, many others. Accordingly, treatments for inflammation are normally tailored to the particular type of inflammation present, as there is no, and there can be no "magic bullet" against inflammation generally.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bruck Kifle, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0668. The examiner can normally be reached Tuesdays to Fridays between 8:30 AM and 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. James Wilson can be reached on 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Bruck Kifle, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1624

BK
May 6, 2005